

Our military defenses have been largely re-shaped over the years since World War II. I assure you, as I did last week, that for the conditions existing today they are both efficient and adequate. But if they are to remain so for the future, their design and power must keep pace with the increasing capabilities that science gives both to the aggressor and the defender. They must continue to perform four main tasks:

1. As a primary deterrent to war, maintain a strong nuclear retaliatory power. The Soviets must be convinced that any attack on us and our Allies would result, regardless of damage to us, in their own national destruction.
2. In cooperation with our Allies, provide a force structure so flexible that it can cope quickly with any form of aggression against the free world.
3. Keep our home defenses in a high state of efficiency.
4. Have the reserve strength to meet unforeseen emergency demands.

To provide this kind of defense requires tax money -- lots of it. During the last five fiscal years we have spent \$11 billion dollars on our security -- an average of over \$2 billion dollars a year. This includes our own Armed Services, Mutual Military Aid, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

In my judgment, the Armed Forces and their scientific associates have, on the whole, used this money wisely and well.

Much of it has gone and is going into better and more powerful weapons.

A single B-52 bomber costs \$8 million. The B-58 wing costs four times as much as the B-56 wing it replaces.

The NIKE missile, which has largely replaced anti-aircraft artillery, costs three times as much per battalion.

A new submarine costs \$47-1/2 million -- ten times the cost of a World War II submarine.

And so on, for our entire arsenal of equipment.

Now, for some years increasing attention has been focused on the invention, development and testing of even more advanced weapons for future use. The Defense Department has been spending in the aggregate over \$1 billion dollars a year on this kind of Research and Development.

There has been much discussion lately about whether Soviet technological break-throughs in particular areas may have suddenly exposed us to immediately increased danger, in spite of the strength of our defenses.

As I pointed out last week, this is not the case. But these scientific accomplishments of theirs have provided us all with renewed evidence of Soviet competence in science and techniques important to modern warfare. We must, and do, regard this as a time for another critical re-examination of our entire defense position.